UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

	No. 19-6088	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	٠,	
Plaintiff - App	pellee,	
v.		
DAVID GRAHAM, a/k/a Orlando	Goodman,	
Defendant - A	appellant.	
Appeal from the United States E Richmond. Henry E. Hudson, Sen cv-00771-HEH-RCY)		_
Submitted: May 23, 2019		Decided: May 29, 2019
Before KING and RICHARDSON	, Circuit Judges, and	SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.
Dismissed by unpublished per curi	am opinion.	
David Graham, Appellant Pro Se.		
Unpublished opinions are not bind	ing precedent in this	circuit.

PER CURIAM:

David Graham seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as time-barred his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2012). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2012). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); *see Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the motion states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. *Slack*, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Graham has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED